



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,432	05/09/2001	Jorg Dietrich	LINDE-566	2115
23599	7590 11/01/2002			
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.			EXAMINER	
SUITE 1400	NDON BLVD.		DUONG, THO V ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
ARLINGTON	N, VA 22201			
			3743	
			DATE MAILED: 11/01/2002	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$\Lambda \mathcal{N}$			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action		09/851,432	DIETRICH, JORG			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Tho v Duong	3743			
The MAILING D	ATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
Therefore, further action I final rejection under 37 C condition for allowance: (2)	by the applicant is required to a FR 1.113 may only be either: (1	THIS APPLICATION IN CONDI void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic al (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in			
	PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
	expires 3 months from the mailing date					
no event, however, v ONLY CHECK THIS 706.07(f)	will the statutory period for reply expire BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
fee have been filed is the date of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is cal (2) as set forth in (b) above, if c	for purposes of determining the period lculated from: (1) the expiration date of	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the mai	R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or ling date of the final rejection, even if			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed ame	endment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ⊠ they are not de issues for app		in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present a	additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.			
NOTE: the ra	ised new issue of "an aluminum o	r aluminum housing" is not allowable	<u>2</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply ha	is overcome the following rejec	tion(s):				
	amended claim(s) would allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5.⊠ The a)☐ affidavit, application in cond	b) \square exhibit, or c) \boxtimes request fo dition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>	r reconsideration has been cons ee Continuation Sheet.	idered but does NOT place the			
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the c	laim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:	<u> </u>					
Claim(s) objected	to:					
Claim(s) rejected:	Claim(s) rejected: <u>8,12,13 and 15-18</u> .					
Claim(s) withdraw	n from consideration:					
8. The proposed draw	ving correction filed on is	s a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached	Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
10. Other:						
						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The method of forming the device "explosive plating" or "being explosively bonded" are not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, these limitations have not been given patentable weight. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The method of forming is only given patentable weight if it is in the process claims.

Henn Bennett Supervisory Patent Examiner